arXiv:1410.2142v1 [math.CO] 5 Oct 2014

Maxima of the Q-index: forbidden even cycles

Vladimir Nikiforov* and Xiying Yuan†‡

October 9, 2014

Abstract

Let G be a graph of order n and let $q(G)$ be the largest eigenvalue of the signless Laplacian of G. Let $S_{n,k}$ be the graph obtained by joining each vertex of a complete graph of order k to each vertex of an independent set of order $n-k$; and let $S_{n,k}^+$ be the graph obtained by adding an edge to $S_{n,k}$.

It is shown that if $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 400k^2$, and G is a graph of order n, with no cycle of length $2k+2$, then $q(G) < q\left(S_{n,k}^+\right)$, unless $G = S_{n,k}^+$. This result completes the proof of a conjecture of de Freitas, Nikiforov and Patuzzi.

AMS classification: *15A42, 05C50*

Keywords: *signless Laplacian; largest eigenvalue; forbidden cycles; spectral extremal problems.*

1 Introduction

Given a graph G, the Q-index of G is the largest eigenvalue $q(G)$ of its signless Laplacian $Q(G)$. In this paper we study how large can $q(G)$ be if G is a graph of given order and contains no cycle of given even length.

Thus, let $S_{n,k}$ be the graph obtained by joining each vertex of a complete graph of order k to each vertex of an independent set of order $n-k$, that is to say, $S_{n,k} = K_k \vee \overline{K}_{n-k}$. Also, let $S_{n,k}^+$ be the graph obtained by adding an edge to $S_{n,k}$. In [7] the following conjecture has been raised:

Conjecture 1 *Let $k \geq 2$ and let G be a graph of sufficiently large order n. If G has no cycle of length $2k+1$, then $q(G) < q(S_{n,k})$, unless $G = S_{n,k}$. If G has no cycle of length $2k+2$, then $q(G) < q\left(S_{n,k}^+\right)$, unless $G = S_{n,k}^+$.*

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Memphis, Memphis TN 38152, USA; *email: vnikiforv@memphis.edu*

†Corresponding author. Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai, 200444, China; email: *xiyingyuan2007@hotmail.com*

‡Research supported by National Science Foundation of China (No. 11101263), and by a grant of "The First-class Discipline of Universities in Shanghai".

In [11] it was shown that Conjecture 1 is asymptotically true and some proof technique has been outlined. In [14] and [15] the second author developed this technique further and succeeded to prove Conjecture 1 for forbidden odd cycles. In this paper we shall prove the remaining case of the conjecture, which turns out to be by far more difficult than the odd case. Thus, our main result is the following theorem:

Theorem 2 *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 400k^2$, and let G be a graph of order n. If G has no cycle of length $2k+2$, then $q(G) < q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$, unless $G = S_{n,k}^{+}$.*

In the next section we prepare the ground for the proof of Theorem 2 and in Section 3 we give the proof itself. At the end we give a sum up of our work.

2 Notation and supporting results

For graph notation and concepts undefined here, we refer the reader to [1]. For introductory material on the signless Laplacian see the survey of Cvetković [2] and its references. In particular, let G be a graph, and X and Y be disjoint sets of vertices of G. We write:

- $V(G)$ for the set of vertices of G and $E(G)$ for the set of edges of G;
- $|G|$ for the number of vertices of G and $e(G)$ for the number of edges of G;
- $G[X]$ for the graph induced by X, and $e(X)$ for $e(G[X])$;
- G_u for the graph induced by the set $V(G) \setminus \{u\}$, where $u \in V(G)$;
- $e(X,Y)$ for the number of edges joining vertices in X to vertices in Y;
- $\Gamma_G(u)$ (or simply $\Gamma(u)$) for the set of neighbors of a vertex u, and $d_G(u)$ (or simply $d(u)$) for $|\Gamma(u)|$.

We write P_k, C_k, and K_k for the path, cycle, and complete graph of order k. We write $F \subset G$ to indicate that F is a subgraph of G, and we say that a graph G is *F-free* if G contains no subgraphs isomorphic to F.

2.1 Some auxiliary results

Here we state several known results, all of which are used in Section 3. We start with a result of Dirac [4].

Theorem 3 *If G is a graph with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then G contains a cycle longer than $\delta(G)$.*

Dirac's result has been further developed by Erdős and Gallai [5]. We shall need the following classical theorems from their paper.

Theorem 4 *Let $k \geq 1$. If G is a graph of order n, with no P_{k+2}, then $e(G) \leq kn/2$, with equality holding if and only if G is a union of disjoint copies of K_{k+1}.*

Theorem 5 *Let $k \geq 2$. If G is a graph of order n, with no cycle longer than k, then $e(G) \leq k(n-1)/2$, with equality holding if and only if G is a union of copies of K_k, all sharing a single vertex.*

The following structural extension of Theorem 4 has been established in [8].

Lemma 6 *Let $k \geq 1$ and let the vertices of a graph G be partitioned into two sets A and B. If*

$$2e(A) + e(A,B) > (2k-1)|A| + k|B|,$$

then there exists a path of order $2k+1$ with both endvertices in A.

To state the next result define the graph $L_{t,k}$ by $L_{t,k} := K_1 \vee tK_k$, i.e., $L_{t,k}$ consists of t complete graphs K_{k+1}, all sharing a single common vertex. In [10], the following stability result has been proved.

Theorem 7 *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 2k+3$, and G be a graph of order n with $\delta(G) \geq k$. If G is connected, then $P_{2k+3} \subset G$, unless one of the following holds:*

(i) $G \subset S^+_{n,k}$;

(ii) $n = tk+1$ *and* $G = L_{t,k}$;

(iii) $n = tk+2$ *and* $G \subset K_1 \vee ((t-1)K_k \cup K_{k+1})$;

(iv) $n = (s+t)k+2$ *and G is obtained by joining the centers of two disjoint graphs $L_{s,k}$ and $L_{t,k}$.*

We shall need, in fact, a particular corollary of Theorem 7, which is easy to check directly.

Corollary 8 *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 2k+3$, and let G be a connected P_{2k+3}-free graph of order n with $\delta(G) \geq k$. Then $e(G) \leq (k+1)n/2$, unless $G \subset S^+_{n,k}$ and $e(G) \leq kn$.*

Another statement that we shall need is a variant of Theorem 7 for the case $k = 1$; we omit its easy proof.

Lemma 9 *If G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 5$. If G contains no P_5, then one of the following holds:*

(i) $G \subset S^+_{n,1}$;

(ii) *G is obtained by joining the centers of two disjoint stars.*

We finish this subsection with two known upper bounds on $q(G)$. The first one can be traced back to Merris [12], while the case of equality has been established in [6].

Theorem 10 *For every graph G,*

$$q(G) \leq \max\left\{ d(u) + \frac{1}{d(u)} \sum_{v \in \Gamma(u)} d(v) : u \in V(G) \right\}. \tag{1}$$

If G is connected, equality holds if and only if G is regular or semiregular bipartite.

Finally, let us mention the following bound, due to Das [3].

Theorem 11 *If G is a graph with n vertices and m edges, then*

$$q(G) \leq \frac{2m}{n-1} + n - 2, \tag{2}$$

with equality holding if and only if G is either complete, or is a star, or is a complete graph with one isolated vertex.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

Before going further, we shall make three remarks. First, recall an estimate of $q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$ given in [7], where it was shown that if $k \geq 2$ and $n > 5k^2$, then

$$n + 2k - 2 - \frac{2k\,(k-1)}{n+2k+2} > q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right) > n + 2k - 2 - \frac{2k\,(k-1)}{n+2k-3}. \tag{3}$$

Second, note that if G is a graph with $q(G) \geq q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$, then $e(G)$ cannot be much smaller than $e\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$. Indeed, in view of Das's bound (2) we have

$$q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right) \leq q(G) \leq \frac{2e(G)}{n-1} + n - 2,$$

and so

$$e(G) \geq kn - k^2 + 1 = e\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right) - \frac{k\,(k-1)}{2}. \tag{4}$$

Finally, given a vertex u of graph G, note that

$$\sum_{\{u,v\}\in E(G)} d\,(v) = 2e\left(\Gamma\,(u)\right) + e\left(\Gamma\,(u), V\,(G)\setminus\Gamma\,(u)\right).$$

We shall use this equality with no explicit reference.

Our proof of Theorem 2 is rather long and complicated. To improve the presentation we have extracted a large segment of it into Lemma 12 and Theorem 13 below. Since these assertions are subordinate to the proof of Theorem 2, their statements look somewhat technical.

Lemma 12 *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 400k^2$, let G be a C_{2k+2}-free graph of order n with*

$$q\,(G) \geq q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right).$$

Let w be a dominating vertex of G, suppose that $G_1, \ldots, G_p$ are the components of G_w of order at most $3k^2$, and let $H := G - \cup_{i=1}^{p} G_i$. Then $|H| \geq 3n/10$ and

$$q\,(H) > q\left(S_{|H|,k}^{+}\right),$$

unless $H = G$ and $q\,(H) = q\,(G) = q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$.

Proof If $p = 0$, the proof is completed, so let us assume that $p \geq 1$. We shall use induction on p. Let $|G_i| := n_i$, and $H_s := G - \cup_{i=1}^{s} G_i$. First we shall prove that $q\,(H_1) > q\left(S_{n-n_1,k}^{+}\right)$. For short, set $q := q\,(G)$ and $V := V\,(G)$. Letting $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a positive unit eigenvector to q, from the eigenequation for q and the vertex w we see that

$$(q - n + 1)\,x_w = \sum_{i\in V\setminus\{w\}} x_i \leq \sqrt{(n-1)\,(1-x_w^2)}.$$

Now, in view of $n \geq 400k^2 \geq 5k^2$ and (3), we see that

$$q \geq q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right) > n + 2k - 3,$$

and so,

$$x_w^2 \leq \frac{n-1}{(q-n+1)^2 + n - 1} \leq \frac{n-1}{n-1+4(k-1)^2} < 1 - \frac{4(k-1)^2}{n+4k^2}. \tag{5}$$

Next, letting

$$x = \max\left\{x_i \mid i \in V(G_1)\right\}, \tag{6}$$

we have

$$qx \leq n_1 x + (n_1 - 1)x + x_w,$$

and so

$$x \leq \frac{x_w}{q - 2n_1 + 1} \leq \frac{x_w}{n + 2k - 2n_1 - 2} \leq \frac{x_w}{n - 6k^2}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} q(H_1) &\geq q(H_1)\left(1 - \sum_{i \in V(G_1)} x_i^2\right) \geq \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E(H_1)} (x_i + x_j)^2 \\ &= q(G) - \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E(G_1)} (x_i + x_j)^2 - \sum_{i \in V(G_1)} (x_i + x_w)^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using (6) and (5), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E(G_1)} (x_i + x_j)^2 + \sum_{i \in V(G_1)} (x_i + x_w)^2 &\leq 2n_1(n_1 - 1)x^2 + n_1(x + x_w)^2 \\ &\leq n_1\left(1 + \frac{2}{n - 6k^2} + \frac{2n_1 - 1}{(n - 6k^2)^2}\right) x_w^2 \\ &\leq n_1\left(1 + \frac{21}{10(n - 6k^2)}\right)\left(1 - \frac{4(k-1)^2}{n + 4k^2}\right) \\ &\leq n_1\left(1 - \frac{3}{2n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} q(H_1) &\geq q(G) - n_1 + \frac{3n_1}{2n} \geq n - n_1 + 2k - 2 - \frac{2k(k-1)}{n + 2k - 3} + \frac{3n_1}{2n} \\ &> n - n_1 + 2k - 2 - \frac{2k(k-1)}{n - n_1 + 2k + 2} > q\left(S_{n-n_1,k}^{+}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We can apply this argument repeatedly, as long as the remaining graph H_i is of order at least $100k^2$. Assume that there exists some j such that $|H_{j-1}| \geq 100k^2$, while $|H_j| < 100k^2$. Set for short $t := n_1 + \cdots + n_j$, and note that

$$q(H_j) \geq q(G) - t + \frac{3t}{2n}.$$

Since $C_s \nsubseteq H_j$ for any $s \geq 2k+2$, Theorem 5 implies that

$$e(H_j) \leq (k+1/2)(n-t-1)$$

and Das's bound (2) implies that

$$q(H_j) \leq \frac{2e(H_j)}{n-t-1} + n - t - 2 \leq n - t + 2k - 1.$$

In view of

$$q(H_j) \geq q(G) - t + \frac{3t}{2n} > n - t + 2k - 2 - \frac{2k(k-1)}{n+2k-3} + \frac{3t}{2n},$$

we have

$$t < \frac{7}{10}n,$$

which implies that $|H| \geq 3n/10 > 100k^2$, and this contradiction completes the proof of Lemma 12. □

Lemma 12 is crucial for the next theorem, where it will be used to improve the structure of a graph at the price of a moderate reduction of its order.

Theorem 13 *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 400k^2$, and let G be a graph of order n. If $q(G) \geq q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right)$ and $\Delta(G) = n-1$, then $C_{2k+2} \subset G$, unless $G = S^+_{n,k}$.*

Proof Assume that $C_{2k+2} \nsubseteq G$. To prove the theorem we need to show that $G = S^+_{n,k}$. Let w be a dominating vertex of G. Applying Lemma 12, we can find an induced subgraph $H \subset G$ with the following properties:

- H is C_{2k+2}-free;
- w is a dominating vertex in H;
- $|H| \geq 3n/10 > 100k^2$;
- every component of H_w is of order greater than $3k^2$;
- $q(H) > q\left(S^+_{|H|,k}\right)$, unless $H = G$ and $q(H) = q(G) = q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right)$.

Thus, to complete the proof of Theorem 13 it is enough to prove the following statement:

Theorem A *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq 100k^2$, let G be a C_{2k+2}-free graph of order n, and let w be a dominating vertex of G such that each component of G_w is greater than $3k^2$. If $q(G) \geq q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right)$, then $G = S^+_{n,k}$.*

We proceed with the proof of Theorem A, keeping the notation for G and n, although now $n > 100k^2$. Thus, assume that G and n satisfy the premises of Theorem A and $q(G) \geq q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$. We shall prove that $G = S_{n,k}^{+}$. For convenience choose G so that it has maximum Q-index among all graphs satisfying the premises of Theorem A. Next observe that inequality (4) implies that

$$e(G) \geq kn - k^2 + 1,$$

and so

$$e(G_w) = e(G) - n + 1 \geq (k-1)n - k^2 + 2. \tag{7}$$

We shall dispose of the case $k = 2$ before anything else, as most of our arguments work for $k \geq 3$ and need changes to work for $k = 2$.

Claim 1. *Theorem A holds for $k = 2$.*

Proof. If $k = 2$, then G_w consist of components of order greater than 12. Since $\delta(G_w) \geq 1$ and $P_5 \nsubseteq G_w$, Lemma 9 implies that the components of G_w are of the two types given in clauses *(i)* and *(ii)*. If $G_i \subset S_{|G_i|,1}^{+}$, we see that $G_i = S_{|G_i|,1}^{+}$, as $q(G)$ is maximal. Now assume that G_i is a component of G_w consisting of two stars whose centers are joined by an edge; let u and v be the centers of these stars; let $u_1, \ldots, u_s$ be the neighbors of u and $v_1, \ldots, v_t$ be the neighbors of v. Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a unit positive eigenvector to $q(G)$; by symmetry suppose that $x_u \geq x_v$. Remove all edges $\{v_i, v\}$ and join $v_1, \ldots, v_t$ to u. In this way G_i is transformed into a star $S_{s+t+2,1}$; now make it an $S_{s+t+2,1}^{+}$ by adding an edge to it. A brief calculation shows that the resulting graph G' satisfies $q(G') > q(G)$, which contradicts the choice of G. Hence each component G_i of G_w satisfies $G_i = S_{|G_i|,1}^{+}$.

Finally, if G_w has two components $G_1 = S_{|G_1|,1}^{+}$ and $G_2 = S_{|G_2|,1}^{+}$, replace them by a component $S_{|G_1|+|G_2|,1}^{+}$ and write G'' for the resulting graph. Clearly $C_6 \nsubseteq G''$ and we shall show that $q(G'') > q(G)$, which contradicts our choice of G. Let u and v be the dominating vertices in G_1 and G_2. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a positive unit eigenvector to $q(G)$. By symmetry we may suppose that $x_u \geq x_v$. Now remove all edges of G_2 and join all vertices of G_2 to u. In this way G_1 and G_2 are replaced by a single component $S_{|G_1|+|G_2|,1}^{+}$. For short, let $n_1 := |G_1|$, $n_2 := |G_2|$, and $q := q(G)$. Let $W := V\left(S_{n_2,k-1}^{+}\right) \setminus \{v\}$ and let $v', v'' \in W$ be the two exceptional vertices of G_2 such that $\{v', v''\} \in E(G)$. By symmetry, $x_{v'} = x_{v''}$ and from the eigenequations for q we see that

$$\begin{aligned} qx_{v'} &= 3x_{v'} + x_{v''} + x_v + x_w = 4x_{v'} + x_v + x_w, \\ qx_v &= n_2 x_v + x_{v'} + x_{v''} + x_w + \sum_{s \in W \setminus \{v', v''\}} x_s \\ &> n_2 x_v + 2x_{v'} + x_w. \end{aligned}$$

Excluding x_w from these relations, after some algebra we see that

$$(q - n_2 + 1)\, x_v > (q-2)\, x_{v'}$$

and so $x_{v''} = x_{v'} < x_v$. A brief calculation shows that the resulting graph G' satisfies $q(G') > q(G)$, which contradicts the choice of G. This contradiction shows that G_w has only one component and so $G = S^+_{n,2}$, completing the proof of Claim 1.

To the end of the proof we shall assume that $k \geq 3$.

Claim 2. *There exists an induced subgraph H of G_w such that $\delta(H) \geq k-1$ and $|H| \geq n - k^2 + k$.*

Proof. Define a sequence of graphs, $F_0 \supset F_1 \supset \cdots \supset F_r \supset \cdots$ using the following procedure:

$F_0 := G_w$;
$i := 0$;
while $\delta(F_i) < k-1$ **do begin**
    select a vertex $v \in V(F_i)$ with $d(v) = \delta(F_i)$;
    $F_{i+1} := F_i - v$;
    $i := i + 1$;
end.

Note that for each $r = 0, 1, \ldots$, we have $|F_r| = n-r-1$ and $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq F_r$; thus Theorem 4 implies that

$$e(F_r) \leq \left(k - \frac{1}{2}\right)(n - r - 1).$$

On the other hand, in view of (7), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} e(F_r) &= e(G_w) - \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \delta(F_i) \geq e(G_w) - r(k-2) \\ &\geq (k-1)n - k^2 + 2 - r(k-2). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Hence,

$$(k-1)n - k^2 + 2 - r(k-2) \leq \left(k - \frac{1}{2}\right)(n - r - 1),$$

and after some algebra we find that

$$3r \leq n + 2k^2 - 2k - 3 < 2n.$$

that is to say, the procedure stops before $i \geq 2n/3$. Next, with a more involved argument, we shall show that the procedure stops before $i > k^2 - k - 1$.

Let $H = F_r$, where r is the last value of the variable i. Let H_i be a component of H and set $n_i := |H_i|$. We claim that $e(H_i) \leq (k-1)n_i$.

Indeed if $n_i \leq 2k-1$, then

$$e(H_i) \leq \frac{n_i(n_i - 1)}{2} \leq (k-1)n_i.$$

If $n_i = 2k$ and H_i is Hamiltonian, then H_i is a component of G_w as otherwise $P_{2k+1} \subset G_w$. But all components of G_w are of order at least $3k^2 > 2k$, so H_i is not Hamiltonian. In this case, Ore's theorem [13] implies that

$$e(H_i) \leq \frac{(n_i - 1)(n_i - 2)}{2} + 1 \leq (k-1) n_i.$$

If $n \geq 2k+1$, in view of $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq H_i$ and $\delta(H_i) \geq k-1$, it follows that H_i satisfies one of the clauses of Theorem 7, and so Corollary 8 implies that $e(H_i) \leq (k-1) n_i$. Summing over all components of H, we find that

$$e(H) \leq (k-1)(n-r-1).$$

On the other hand, in view of (8) we find that

$$(k-1) n - k^2 + 2 - r(k-2) \leq (k-1)(n-r-1),$$

and so, $r \leq k^2 - k - 1$. Therefore, H satisfies the requirements of Claim 2, which is thus proved.

Let H' be the subgraph of G_w induced by the vertex set $V(G_w) \setminus V(H)$, which may be empty. Let $H_1, \ldots, H_p$ be the components of H and let $n_1, \ldots, n_p$ be their orders.

Claim 3. *Each component H_i of H satisfies $H_i \subset S^+_{|H_i|,k-1}$.*

Proof. First note that each component of G_w contains at most one component of H. Indeed, since for each component H_i of H, we have $\delta(H_i) \geq k-1 \geq 2$, Dirac's Theorem 3 implies that $C_l \subset H_i$, for some $l \geq k$; hence each component of G_w contains at most one component of H, as otherwise $P_{2k+1} \subset G_w$.

Further, if H_i is a component of H and G_i is a component of G_w containing H_i, there are at most $k^2 - k - 1$ vertices in $V(G_i) \setminus V(H_i)$; since $|G_i| > 3k^2$, the order of H_i satisfies

$$|H_i| > 3k^2 - k^2 + k + 1 > 2k^2.$$

Assume for a contradiction that H_i is a component of H such that $H_i \nsubseteq S^+_{n_i,k-1}$. Note that $n_i > 2k^2 > 2k+1$, $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq H_i$, and $\delta(H_i) \geq k-1$. Using Theorem 7, we see that H_i is one of the graphs from clauses *(ii), (iii)* or *(iv)*. Now Corollary 8 implies that

$$e(H_i) \leq \frac{k n_i}{2}.$$

Since H is P_{2k+1}-free, we have

$$e(H) = e(H_i) + e(V(H) \setminus V(H_i)) \leq \frac{k n_i}{2} + (k-1)(n - 1 - |H'| - n_i).$$

and from (8) we know that

$$e(H) \geq (k-1) n - k^2 + 2 - (k-2)|H'|.$$

After some algebra we see that

$$k^2 - k - 1 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2}k - 1\right) n_i + |H'| \geq k^2,$$

a contradiction, showing that $H_i \subset S^+_{n_i,k-1}$, and completing the proof of Claim 3.

Our next goal is to prove that each component J of G_w is isomorphic to $S^+_{|J|,k-1}$. Since G has maximal $q(G)$, it is enough to prove that each component J of G_w satisfies $J \subset S^+_{|J|,k-1}$.

Let J be a component of G_w. Note that J contains exactly one component F of H, as otherwise it would consist solely of vertices from H', which are at most $k^2 - k - 1$, while J has more than $3k^2$ vertices. Set $m := |F|$; Claim 3 implies that $F \subset S^+_{m,k-1}$. Write A for the set of $k-1$ dominating vertices of $S^+_{m,k-1}$; let $B := V(F) \setminus A$ and

$$C := V(J) \setminus V(F).$$

Since $\delta(F) \geq k-1$, the bipartite subgraph of F induced by the vertex classes A and B contains at least $|A||B| - 2$ edges. If $G[B]$ contains an edge, then each vertex in B is endvertex of a path $P_{2k} \subset F$; since $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq J$, each vertex of C may be joined only to vertices from A. Therefore, $J \subset S^+_{|J|,k-1}$ as long as $G[B]$ contains an edge.

Assume therefore that the set B is independent. Together with $\delta(F) \geq k-1$, this assumption implies that A and B induce a complete bipartite graph in G.

Claim 4. *The set C is independent.*

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} C_A &:= \{u : u \in C \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(u) \cap A \neq \varnothing\}, \\ C_B &:= \{u : u \in C \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(u) \cap B \neq \varnothing\}, \\ C' &:= C \setminus C_B. \end{aligned}$$

Our main goal is to prove that the set C' is independent, which easily implies that C is independent as well. Assume for a contradiction that $G[C']$ contains edges. This fact implies that $C_B = \varnothing$, as $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq J$. For the same reason we see that $G[C']$ contains no P_4 or cycles.

Further, $G[C']$ contains no isolated vertices. Indeed, if $u \in C'$ and u is an isolated vertex in $G[C']$, then it has to be joined to all vertices of A as $q(G)$ is maximal; we see that u has $k-1$ neighbors in H and so u cannot be removed by the procedure of Claim 2, a contradiction.

Hence $G[C']$ is a disjoint union of edges and stars. Note that if S is a star in $G[C']$ of order at least 3, then its center belongs to C_A, but no other vertex of S belongs to C_A, as $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq J$.

Next, assume that $G[C']$ contains a star S of order $t \geq 3$, such that its center i is joined to exactly one vertex $u \in A$; let $u_1, \ldots, u_{t-1}$ be the peripheral vertices of S. Remove the edges $\{u_1, i\}, \ldots, \{u_{t-1}, i\}$ and add the edges $\{u_1, u\}, \ldots, \{u_{t-1}, u\}$; write G' for the

resulting graph, which obviously satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem A. We shall show that $q(G') > q(G)$. First, by symmetry,

$$x_{u_1} = \cdots = x_{u_{t-1}} = p.$$

Next we have

$$\begin{aligned} qp &= 2p + x_i + x_w, \\ qx_u &\geq (m+1)\, x_u + x_i + x_w, \end{aligned}$$

and after some algebra we find that $x_u > p$. Also,

$$qx_i = (t+1)\, x_i + (t-1)\, p + x_u + x_w < (t+1)\, x_i + tx_u + x_w,$$

and after some algebra we find that

$$(q - m - 1 + t)\, x_u > (q - t)\, x_i,$$

implying that $x_u > x_i$. Now a brief calculation shows that $q(G') > q(G)$, contradicting the choice of G.

Hence, if $S \subset G[C']$ is a star of order at least 3, then is center is joined to more than one vertex in A.

Next assume that $G[C']$ is connected. If $G[C']$ is just one edge, then $J \subset S^+_{m,k-1}$, and so $J = S^+_{m,k-1}$ as $q(G)$ is maximal. If $G[C']$ is a star S of order at least 3, then its center i is joined to more than one vertices A. Since $q(G)$ is maximal, i must be joined to all vertices in A; thus i has $k-1$ neighbors in H and so i cannot be removed by the procedure of Claim 2, a contradiction. So $G[C']$ has more than one component.

Finally, assume that u is a vertex of A having a neighbor in C'. If $G[C']$ contains a star S, then the center of S may be joined only to u, as otherwise we can find a $P_{2k+1} \subset J$ using an additional component of $G[C']$. Hence $G[C']$ contains only disjoint edges. Clearly each edge of $G[C']$ contains a vertex of C_A and all such vertices must be joined exactly to u as $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq J$. Since $q(G)$ is maximal, we see that A induces a complete graph, and both ends of each disjoint edge in $G[C']$ are joined to u. We shall show that in this case $q(G)$ is not maximal.

Indeed, let $v \in A \backslash \{u\}$ and let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a positive unit eigenvector to $q(G)$. Suppose that $\{i,j\}$ is an isolated edge in $G[C']$. Remove $\{i,j\}$, add the edges $\{i,v\}$ and $\{j,v\}$; write G' for the resulting graph, which obviously satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem A. By symmetry, $x_i = x_j$; note that

$$\begin{aligned} qx_v &= mx_v + \sum_{s \in A \cup B \backslash \{v\}} x_s + x_w > mx_v + x_u + x_w, \\ qx_i &= 3x_i + x_u + x_j + x_w = 4x_i + x_u + x_w. \end{aligned}$$

After some algebra we find that

$$x_v > \frac{q-4}{q-m} x_i > \frac{q-4}{q-2k^2} x_i > x_i,$$

and a brief calculation shows that $q(G') > q(G)$, contradicting the choice of G. This completes the proof that C' is independent. Therefore C is also independent, as no edge in C can be incident to a vertex in B as $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq J$. This completes the proof of Claim 4.

Further, we can assume that $C' = \varnothing$, as if u is vertex in C', then, in G_w, u can be joined only to vertices of A; since $q(G)$ is maximal, u is joined to each vertex in A; thus i has $k-1$ neighbors in H and so i cannot be removed by the procedure of Claim 2, a contradiction.

Claim 5. *Either $J \subset S^+_{m+1,k-1}$ or the set C is empty.*

Proof. Observe that if a vertex $u \in C_B$ is joined to two or more vertices from B, then $P_{2k+1} \subset J$, so each vertex in C_B is joined to exactly one vertex in B. Now if C_B has two distinct vertices that are joined to two distinct vertices in B, then clearly $P_{2k+1} \subset J$. Therefore, all vertices in C_B are joined to the same vertex of B, say $u \in B$.

Suppose that $C_A \neq \varnothing$ and let $v \in C_A$. Clearly $C_B \backslash C_A = \varnothing$, as $P_{2k+1} \nsubseteq J$; therefore $C_A = C_B = \{v\}$, implying that $J \subset S^+_{m+1,k-1}$.

Hence we may assume that $C_A = \varnothing$, that is to say, all vertices in C are joined only to vertices in B. Now the graph J looks as follows: the set C is independent and all vertices of C are joined exactly to the vertex $u \in B$. We shall show that in this case $q(G)$ is not maximal.

Indeed, choose a vertex $v \in A$ and let $C = \{u_1, \ldots, u_t\}$; remove the edges $\{u_1, u\}, \ldots, \{u_t, u\}$ and add the edges $\{u_1, v\}, \ldots, \{u_t, v\}$; write G' for the resulting graph, which satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem A. We shall show that $x_v > x_u$, which obviously implies that $q(G') > q(G)$, contradicting the choice of G. Note that by symmetry,

$$x_{u_1} = \cdots = x_{u_t} \quad \text{and} \quad x_s = x_v \text{ for every } s \in A.$$

Therefore, letting $x_{u_1} = p$, wee see that

$$\begin{aligned} qx_v &> mx_v + x_u + x_w, \\ qx_u &= (k+t)\,x_u + (k-1)\,x_v + tp + x_w, \\ qp &= 2p + x_u + x_w. \end{aligned}$$

After some algebra we first find that $x_v > p$, and then $x_v > x_u$, as claimed. This completes the proof of Claim 5.

At this stage we see that each component J of G_w satisfies $J = S^+_{|J|,k-1}$; to finish the proof we must show that G_w has only one component. Assume for a contradiction that G_w contains two components, say $G_1 = S^+_{n_1,k-1}$ and $G_2 = S^+_{n_2,k-1}$. We shall show that in this case $q(G)$ is not maximal, which contradicts the choice of G.

Let $u_1, \ldots, u_{k-1}$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}$ be the dominating vertices in G_1 and G_2. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a positive unit eigenvector to $q(G)$. By symmetry,

$$x_{u_1} = \cdots = x_{u_{k-1}}, \quad x_{v_1} = \cdots = x_{v_{k-1}}, \quad \text{and} \quad x_{u_1} \geq x_{v_1}.$$

Now merge the components G_1 and G_2 into one component F by removing all edges of G_2 and joining the vertices of G_2 to each of the vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_{k-1}$. Note that F is

isomorphic to $S^+_{n_1+n_2,\,k-1}$ and $u_1,\ldots,u_{k-1}$ are its dominating vertices. Writing G' for the new graph, we shall show that $q(G') > q(G)$. Indeed, let

$$W := V\left(S^+_{n_2,k-1}\right) \setminus \{v_1,\ldots,v_{k-1}\}$$

and let $v', v'' \in W$ be the two exceptional vertices of G_2 such that $\{v', v''\} \in E(G)$. By symmetry, $x_{v'} = x_{v''}$ and from the eigenequations for q we see that

$$\begin{aligned} qx_{v'} &= (k+1)x_{v'} + x_{v''} + (k-1)\,x_{v_1} + x_w = (k+2)\,x_{v'} + (k-1)\,x_{v_1} + x_w, \\ qx_{v_1} &= n_2 x_{v_1} + (k-2)\,x_{v_1} + x_{v'} + x_{v''} + x_w + \sum_{s\in W\setminus\{v',v''\}} x_s \\ &> (n_2+k-2)\,x_{v_1} + 2x_{v'} + x_w. \end{aligned}$$

Excluding x_w from these relations, after some algebra we see that

$$(q-n_2+1)\,x_{v_1} > (q-k)\,x_{v'}$$

and so $x_{v''} = x_{v'} < x_{v_1}$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} q(G') - q(G) &\geq \langle Q(G')\,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}\rangle - \langle Q(G)\,\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i\in W}(k-1)\left((x_{u_1}+x_i)^2 - (x_{v_1}+x_i)^2\right) \\ &+ (k-1)^2\,(x_{u_1}+x_{v_1})^2 - 2\,(k-1)\,(k-2)\,x_{v_1}^2 - 4x_{v'}^2 \\ &> 4\,(k-1)^2\,x_{v_1}^2 - 2\,(k-1)\,(k-2)\,x_{v_1}^2 - 4x_{v_1}^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction shows that indeed, $G_w = S^+_{n-1,k-1}$ and so $G = S^+_{n,k}$. Theorem A is proved and so is Theorem 13. □

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof Assume for a contradiction that G is a C_{2k+2}-free graph of order $n > 400k^2$, with $q(G) \geq q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right)$. To prove the theorem we shall show that $G = S^+_{n,k}$. For short, set $q := q(G)$ and $V := V(G)$.

Our proof of Theorem 2 will be based on a careful analysis of the Merris bound (1). Thus, let $w \in V$ be a vertex for which the expression

$$d(w) + \frac{1}{d(w)} \sum_{\{w,i\}\in E(G)} d(i)$$

is maximal. First note that $d(w) \geq 2k-1$, as otherwise, using (1), we obtain a contradiction

$$q(G) \leq d(w) + \frac{1}{d(w)} \sum_{\{w,i\}\in E(G)} d(i) \leq d(w) + \Delta(G) \leq n + 2k - 3 < q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right).$$

We shall show that $d(w) \geq n-2$. Indeed, set $A := \Gamma(w)$ and $B := V(G) \setminus (\Gamma(w) \cup \{w\})$. Obviously, $|A| = d(w)$ and $|B| = n - d(w) - 1$. The assumption $C_{2k+2} \nsubseteq G$ implies that the graph G_w contains no path P_{2k+1} with both endvertices in A. Therefore, using Lemma 6, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} d(w) + \frac{1}{d(w)} \sum_{\{w,i\} \in E(G)} d(i) &= d(w) + 1 + \frac{2e(A) + e(A,B)}{d(w)} \\ &\leq d(w) + 1 + \frac{(2k-1)\, d(w) + k(n - d(w) - 1)}{d(w)} \\ &= d(w) + k + \frac{k(n-1)}{d(w)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the function $x + [k(n-1) - 1]/x$ is convex for $x > 0$; hence, the maximum of the expression

$$d(w) + \frac{k(n-1)}{d(w)}$$

is attained for the minimum or the maximum admissible values for $d(w)$. Thus, if

$$2k - 1 \leq d(w) \leq n - 3,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} q(G) &\leq d(w) + \frac{k(n-1)}{d(w)} \leq \max\left\{ 2k - 1 + \frac{k(n-1)}{2k-1}, n - 3 + \frac{k(n-1)}{n-3} \right\} \\ &< n + 2k - 2 - \frac{2(k^2 - k)}{n + 2k - 3} < q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction, showing that $d(w) \geq n - 2$.

At that stage we are left with two cases: $d(w) = n - 1$, covered by Theorem 13 and $d(w) = n - 2$, which will be disposed of in the rest of the proof.

Let v be the single vertex of G such that $v \notin \Gamma(w)$. Let G' be the graph obtained by adding the edge $\{w, v\}$ to G. Since $\Delta(G') = n - 1$, and $q(G') \geq q(G) \geq q\left(S^+_{n,k}\right)$, Theorem 13 implies that G' contains a cycle C_{2k+2}, which obviously contains the edge $\{w, v\}$. Hence, G contains a path P_{2k+2} with endvertices w and v, and moreover, w is adjacent to all vertices of this path except v. This is a definite situation, and it is easy to see that if $d(v) \geq 2$, then $C_{2k+2} \subset G$; hence, $d(v) = 1$.

Write u for the neighbor of v, and let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ be the unit positive eigenvector to q. The eigenequation for the vertex v gives

$$qx_v = x_v + x_u$$

and so

$$x_v = \frac{1}{q-1} x_u.$$

Since $d(u) \leq n-2$, there is a vertex $t \in \Gamma(w) \setminus (\Gamma(u) \cup \{u\})$. Then, from the eigenequation for t we see that

$$qx_t \geq x_t + x_w,$$

and so

$$x_t \geq \frac{1}{q-1} x_w$$

The eigenequation for the vertex w is

$$qx_w = (n-2)\, x_w + \sum_{i \in V \setminus \{w,v\}} x_i, \tag{9}$$

while the eigenequation for the vertex u implies that

$$qx_u = d(u)\, x_u + \sum_{i \in \Gamma(u)} x_i \leq (n-2)\, x_u + \sum_{i \in V \setminus \{u,t\}} x_i. \tag{10}$$

Subtracting (10) from (9), we find that

$$(q-n+3)(x_w - x_u) \geq x_t - x_v \geq \frac{1}{q-1} x_w - \frac{1}{q-1} x_u$$

and so, $x_w \geq x_u$.

Let G' be the graph obtained from G by removing the edge $\{u,v\}$ and adding the edge $\{w,v\}$. Comparing the quadratic forms of $Q(G)$ and $Q(G')$, we find that $q(G') \geq q(G) \geq q\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$. However, $G' \neq S_{n,k}^{+}$ and $\Delta(G') = n-1$; hence Theorem 13 implies that $C_{2k+2} \subset G'$, and consequently $C_{2k+2} \subset G$, as no cycle of G'contains v. This contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 2. □

4 Concluding remarks

Theorem 2 and the main result of [14],[15] prove completely Conjecture 1. An important ingredient of our proof, Theorem 7, which is a nonspectral extremal result, has been obtained in [10]. We would like to reiterate a similar, but yet unproven conjecture for the spectral radius $\mu(G)$, raised in [9].

Conjecture 14 *Let $k \geq 2$ and let G be a graph of sufficiently large order n. If G has no cycle of length $2k+2$, then $\mu(G) < \mu\left(S_{n,k}^{+}\right)$, unless $G = S_{n,k}^{+}$.*

It is somewhat surprising that Conjecture 14 turned out to be more difficult than Conjecture 1, given that in general it is easier to work with the spectra radius than with the Q-index of a graph. Finally, let us note that the corresponding problem about the maximum number of edges in a C_{2k}-free graph of order n is notoriously difficult and is solved only for very few values of k.

References

[1] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory,* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 184, Springer-Verlag, New York (1998).

[2] D. Cvetković, Spectral theory of graphs based on the signless Laplacian, Research Report, (2010), available at: *http://www.mi.sanu.ac.rs/projects/signless_L_reportApr11.pdf.*

[3] K. Das, Maximizing the sum of the squares of the degrees of a graph, *Discrete Math* **285** (2004), 57-66.

[4] G.A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **2** (1952) 69-81.

[5] P. Erdős and T. Gallai, On maximal paths and circuits of graphs, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar* **10** (1959), 337–356.

[6] L. Feng and G. Yu, On three conjectures involving the signless laplacian spectral radius of graphs, *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)* **85** (2009), 35-38.

[7] M.A.A. de Freitas, V. Nikiforov, and L. Patuzzi, Maxima of the Q-index: forbidden 4-cycle and 5-cycle, *Electronic J. Linear Algebra* **26** (2013), 905-916.

[8] V. Nikiforov, Degree powers in graphs with forbidden even cycle, *Electronic J. Combin.* **15** (2009), R107.

[9] V. Nikiforov, The spectral radius of graphs without paths and cycles of specified length, *LinearAlgebra Appl.* **432** (2010), 2243-2256.

[10] V. Nikiforov and X.Y. Yuan, Maxima of the Q-index: graphs without long paths, *Electronic J. Linear Algebra* **27** (2014), 504-514.

[11] V. Nikiforov, An asymptotically tight bound on the Q-index of graphs with forbidden cycles, *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)* **95(109)** (2014), 189-199.

[12] R. Merris, A note on Laplacian graph eigenvalues, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **295** (1998), 33-35.

[13] O. Ore, Note on Hamilton circuits, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **67** (1960), 55.

[14] X.Y. Yuan, Maxima of the Q-index: forbidden odd cycles, *Linear Algebra and Appl.* **458** (2014), 207-216.

[15] X.Y. Yuan, Maxima of the Q-index: forbidden odd cycles, Preprint available at *ArXiv:1401.4363v3*